



2137971485

335.05 S0133 V.28-29 1960-62 MAIN



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

335.05
S0133

SPRING 1960

STATE ACQUISITIONS
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS LIBRARY
AUSTIN 12, TEXAS
MAR 1960

THE SOCIALIST CALL

ss 42

Erich Fromm
The Basis of Humanist Socialism

Hugh Gaitskell
British Socialism Up to Date

Norman Thomas
A Socialist Program for 1960

Pershottam Triकुन्दas
Socialism as a Way of Life

Herman Singer
The New Revisionism

VOLUME XXVIII

NUMBER 1

FIFTY CENTS

THE SOCIALIST CALL

Editorial Board: Robert J. Alexander, Leon Dennen, Erich Fromm, Harry Fleischman, Harry W. Laidler, Aaron Levenstein, Benjamin Miller, Ernst Papanek, Herman Singer, Norman Thomas.

The SOCIALIST CALL, official organ of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, is published quarterly by the Call Association, Inc., a nonprofit foundation dedicated to the creation of a cooperative commonwealth, at 303 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y. Telephone: GRamercy 3-4286. Fifty cents an issue. Two dollars for a yearly subscription.

Signed articles do not necessarily represent the opinion of the SOCIALIST CALL or of the Call Association, Inc.

Re-entered as second class matter November 2, 1953, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Second class postage paid at the General Post Office, New York, N.Y.

Volume XXVIII

Spring, 1960

341 

Number 1

CONTENTS

THE NEW REVISIONISM	3
Herman Singer	
THE BASIS OF HUMANIST SOCIALISM	6
Erich Fromm	
A NEW SOCIALIST PROGRAM	12
From the Basic Program of the SPD	
A SOCIALIST PROGRAM FOR 1960	17
Norman Thomas	
BRITISH SOCIALISM BROUGHT UP TO DATE	21
Hugh Gaitskell	
SOCIALISM AS A WAY OF LIFE	24
Pershottam Trikulmdas	

THE NEW REVISIONISM

ERICH FROMM is the author of *Escape from Freedom, A Sane Society*, and other works of social psychology. The article published in this issue of THE SOCIALIST CALL is a section of a pamphlet scheduled for publication by the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation.

HUGH GAITSKELL is the leader of the British Labor Party.

PERSHOTTAM TRIKUMDAS is former chairman of the Praja Socialist Party of India.

A NEW SOCIALIST PROGRAM is an excerpt from the New Basic Program of the German Democratic Party adopted earlier this year.

A GREATER part of this issue of the SOCIALIST CALL comprises some of the essential documents in the recent "revision" of socialist doctrines. In addition to bringing together for the first time in an American publication some of the changing views in socialist thought, this collection helps to point up a fact that is itself somewhat surprising. Within the past few years, some of the leading Socialist parties in Europe, particularly the British Labor Party and the German Social Democratic Party, have either made major changes in their basic programs, or have instituted discussions which will apparently lead in that direction.

Although this development has its own significance, it is not quite as abrupt as some commentators have assumed. The changes that Socialist parties have begun to make in their programs derive from the combined impact of the Communist and Nazi experiences and the rise of welfarism. The response to these factors was in evidence almost a decade ago, when the Socialist International acted on *Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism*.

The Aims and Tasks

Adopted in 1951 at the first meeting of the reconstituted Socialist International held after the Second World War, the *Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism* took into account the changes that had occurred on the world scene since the First World War. The document set forth acceptance of four vital views. It affirmed democratic socialist support of democracy as the only means through which socialism could be achieved; it supported a variety of

economic methods for replacing capitalism "by a system in which the public interest takes precedence over the interest of private profit"; it set forth as the guiding principle of socialism "the satisfaction of human needs"; it dedicated socialists to the fight against "oppression of exploitation of any people."

In summary, the document stated:

"Socialists work for a world of peace and freedom, for a world in which the exploitation and enslavement of men by men and people by people is unknown, for a world in which the development of the individual personality is the basis of the fruitful development of all mankind. They appeal to the solidarity of all working men in the struggle for this great aim."

It is clear that this document encompassed a good many of the recent changes that have been introduced into various Socialist Party programs. It can be seen too that the emphasis is not where most commentators have put it, that is, that there is no overriding interest in nationalization as the primary innovation of the new programs. It is unfortunate that the argument has been permitted to develop over this issue, for *Aims and Tasks* had indicated that Socialist parties accepted a variety of economic means to achieve control of the economy. While the extent of nationalization, which in any event would differ according to circumstances, is an appropriate question, this is hardly the sum of the present discussion.

In the British Labor Party, where adherents of revisionism and their opponents have tended to emphasize the debate over nationalization, the compromise at which they have now arrived

goes much beyond this single issue. Thus, the statement on Clause IV adopted by the National Executive Committee of the BLP on March 16, 1960, was a considerable expansion of the original clause, and actually made no substantive change in it. Incidentally, the original, about which the controversy has raged, did not call for nationalization of all industry, but for securing for the "workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of common ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service."

This has now been expanded to encompass a whole range of concerns, including creation of a socialist community based on "fellowship, cooperation and service," a classless society "from which all class barriers and false social values have been eliminated," and the duty of "richer nations to assist poorer nations and to do all in their power to abolish poverty throughout the world."

The key element in the revised clause may be the one which asserts that the BLP "stands for social justice, for a society in which the claims of those in hardship or distress come first; where differences in rewards depend not upon birth or inheritance but on effort, skill and creative energy contributed to the common good; and where equal opportunities exist for all to live a full and varied life."

While these concepts are unexceptionable as a restatement of socialist values, they, like the new views of other Socialist parties, do not move very deeply in probing the problems of the future.

To some extent, the value of the

discussion concerning the new socialism lies in indicating what has yet to be done. Accepting a fluid view toward nationalization and advocating the use of modern technical devices to achieve economic equality, while they have a legitimate usefulness for Socialists, do not constitute enough of an innovation to bring socialism up to date. Moreover, there has always been a difference between the doctrines of the various European Socialist parties and their programs as practiced. It is for this reason that the German Social Democrats, for example, have been able to make the leap from support of traditional Marxism to advocacy of the view that "private ownership of the means of production can claim protection by society as long as it does not hinder the establishment of social justice." Because the Socialist parties have actually been revisionist in practice, the change to revisionism on paper has hardly been as resounding as it has been made to appear.

The Place of Man

Possibly a more important phase of the new revisionism is that it has opened up for discussion the place of man in a world which has inherited a set of problems which are much more formidable than those which faced early socialist thinkers. Much of the original socialist emphasis was on making available to the workers the products of their labor. Even though this result has hardly been achieved, the socialist prediction that production could be sufficient to provide for the economic security of mankind has been proved.

Technological developments within the past twenty years, particularly those which emerged after the Second World War, have given a new impetus to in-

dustrial revolution. It may well be that the scientific revolution of our time is one which can only be appropriately analyzed from a distance of many years. At the moment, two developments are evident. The scientific revolution is no longer a monopoly of the Western nations. The peoples of Asia and Africa are insistent in wishing to share in the bounty of productive progress. Here the vision of socialism as a cooperative venture in serving humanity has a meaningful role to play.

The second revolution in science has also seen the massive growth of nuclear weapons and their potentialities for wiping out vast segments of humanity. There has hardly been a period in human history when prophets have not suggested the possibility that the world may be moving to an end. Our age differs from these earlier periods in that the prophets appear most frequently among the scientists who are creating the media of the destruction they foretell.

In the face of these two impersonal phenomena, it is noticeable that current socialist revisionism has begun to emphasize the need for a formula which will enable man to feel at home—economically, psychologically, and physically—in the world into which he was born. This approach has the additional value of focusing on developments in the Soviet Union, Communist China, and other Communist-controlled countries, where the de-humanization of man-

kind has occurred not as a by-product of industrial development, but as a purposeful design to support the functioning of the totalitarian state. In seeking to discover means of offsetting the absorption of man by machine the new revisionists have indicated a course which shows the solidarity of democratic socialists with those workers and peasants whose lives are controlled by Communist rulers to whom rule by technology is a basic element of control.

Given the complexity of the problems, it is obvious that no simple solution is possible, nor can one be expressed in a concise formula. What has been called the specter of revisionism has, however, opened a new area of discussion for Socialists, and it is worth noting that the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation has, through its distribution of Dr. Erich Fromm's pamphlet, and through its Special Projects Committee, been making a real contribution to the problem.

Because these are questions in which all of mankind is involved, it is important to realize that this discussion is one in which all those concerned with the future of freedom should contribute. The guide lines of the world's future will be those of socialism. It is the concern of Socialists that this development should occur in an atmosphere in which man lives with his fellow-men in peace, equality and freedom.

HERMAN SINGER

The Basis of Humanist Socialism

Erich Fromm

SOcialism in the XIXth century, in the Marxian and in its many other forms, wanted to create the material basis for a dignified human existence for everybody. It wanted work to direct capital, rather than that capital should direct work. For socialism, work and capital were not just two economic and social categories, but rather they represented two universal principles: capital, the principle of amassed things, of *having*; and work, that of life and of man's powers, of *being*, and becoming. Socialists found that in capitalism things direct life; that *having* is superior to *being*; that the past directs the present—and they wanted to reverse this relation.

The aim of socialism was man's emancipation, his restoration to the unalienated, uncrippled individual who enters into a new, rich, spontaneous relationship with his fellow-man and with nature. The aim of socialism was that man should throw away the chains which bind him, the fictions and unrealities, and transform himself into a being who can make creative use of his powers of feeling and of thinking.

Socialism wanted man to become independent, that is, to stand on his own feet; and it believed that man can only stand on his feet if, as Marx said, "he owes his existence to himself, if he affirms his individuality as a total man in each of his relations to the world, seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, thinking, willing, loving—in short, if he affirms and expresses all organs of his individuality." The aim of socialism was the union between man and man, and between man and nature.

Man as an End

The aim of socialism was individuality, not uniformity; liberation from economic bonds, not making material aims the main concern of life; the experience of full solidarity of all men, and not the manipulation and domination of one man by another. The principle of socialism was that each man is an end in himself, and must never be the means of another man. Socialism wanted to create a society in which each citizen actively and responsibly participated in all decisions, and in which he could participate because he was a man and not a thing, because he had convictions and not synthetic opinions.

What are the *principles* which underlie the idea of a humanist socialism?

- Every social and economic system is not only a specific system of relations between things and institutions, but a system of human relations. Any concept and practice of socialism must be examined in terms of the kind of relations between human beings to which it is conducive.

- The supreme value in all social and economic arrangements is man; the goal of society is to offer the conditions for the full development of man's potentialities, his reason, his love, his creativity; all social arrangements must be conducive to overcoming the alienation and crippledness of man, and to enable him to achieve real freedom and individuality. The aim of socialism is an association in which the full development of each is the condition for the full development of all.

- The supreme principle of socialism is that man takes precedence over things, life over property, and hence, work over capital; that power follows creation, and not possession; that man must not be governed by circumstances, but circumstances must be governed by man.

- In relations between people, the principle must govern that every man is an end in himself, and must never be made into a means to another's ends. From this principle it follows that nobody must personally be subject to anyone because he owns capital.

The Solidarity of All Men

- Humanist socialism is rooted in the conviction of the unity of mankind and the solidarity of all men. It fights any kind of worship of state, nation or class. It considers that the supreme loyalty of man must be that to the human race, and to the moral principles of humanism. It strives for the revitalization of those ideas and values upon which Western civilization was built.

- Humanist socialism is radically opposed to war and violence in all and any form. It considers any attempt to solve political and social problems by force and violence not only as futile, but as immoral and inhuman. Hence it is uncompromisingly opposed to all kinds of armament as to any policy which tries to achieve security by armament. It considers peace to be not only the absence of war, but a positive principle of human relations based on free cooperation of all men for the common good.

- From socialist principles it follows not only that each member of society feels responsible for his fellow citizens, but for all citizens of the world. The injustice which lets two-thirds of the human

race starve or die must be removed by an effort far beyond the ones hitherto made by the wealthy nations, to help the underdeveloped nations to arrive at a humanly satisfactory economic level.

- Humanist socialism stands for freedom. It stands for freedom from fear, want, oppression and violence. But freedom is not only freedom from, but also freedom to; freedom to participate actively and responsibly in all decisions concerning the citizen, freedom to develop the individual's human potential to the fullest possible degree.

- Production and consumption must be subordinated to the needs of man's development, not the reverse. As a consequence, all production must be directed by the principle of its social usefulness, and not by that of its material profit for some individuals or corporations. Hence, if a choice has to be made between greater production on the one hand, or greater freedom and human growth on the other, the human as against the material value must be chosen.

- In socialist industrialism the goal is not to achieve the highest economic productivity, but to achieve the highest human productivity. This means that the way in which man spends most of his energy in work as well as in leisure must be meaningful and interesting to him. It must stimulate and help to develop all his human powers—his intellectual as well as his emotional artistic ones.

- While, in order to live humanly, basic material needs must be satisfied, consumption must not be an aim in itself. All attempts to stimulate material needs artificially for the sake of profit must be prevented. Waste of material resources, and senseless consumption for

consumption's sake, is destructive to mature human development.

● Humanist socialism is a system in which man governs capital, not capital man; in which man governs his circumstances, not circumstances man; in which the members of society plan what they want to produce, rather than that their production follows the laws of the impersonal powers of the market and of capital with its inherent need for maximum profit.

● Humanist socialism is the extension of the democratic process beyond the purely political realm, into the economic sphere; it is political and industrial democracy. It is the restoration of political democracy to its original meaning: the true participation of informed and responsible citizens in all decisions affecting them.

● Extension of democracy into the economic sphere means democratic control of all economic activities by the participants, (manual workers, engineers, administrators, etc.). Humanist socialism is not primarily concerned with legal ownership, but with social control of the large and powerful industries. Irresponsible control by bureaucratic management representing the profit interest of capital must be replaced by administration acting on behalf of, and controlled by, those who produce and consume.

● The aim of humanist socialism can be attained only by the introduction of a maximum of decentralization compatible with a minimum of centralization necessary for the functioning of an industrial society. The functions of a centralized state must be reduced to a minimum, while the voluntary activity of freely cooperating citizens constitutes the central mechanism of social life.

● Humanist socialism is the voluntary, logical outcome of the operation of human nature under rational conditions. It is the realization of democracy which has its roots in the humanist tradition of mankind, under the conditions of an industrial society. It is a social system which operates without force, neither physical force, nor that of hypnoid suggestions by which men are forced without being aware of it. It can be achieved only by appealing to man's reason, and to his longing for a more human, meaningful and rich life. It is based on faith in man's ability to build a world which is truly human, in which the enrichment of life and the unfolding of the individual are the prime objects of society, while economics are reduced to their proper role as means for a humanly richer life.

Intermediate Goals of Socialism

In discussing the goals of humanist socialism we must differentiate between the final socialist goal of a society based on the free cooperation of its citizens and the reduction of centralized state activity to a minimum, and the intermediate socialist goals before this final aim is reached. The transition from the present centralized state to a completely decentralized form of society cannot be made without a long transitory period in which central planning and state intervention will be indispensable. But it is necessary from the beginning that the bureaucratic form of control is increasingly replaced by one which permits and encourages the active and responsible participation of each citizen in all spheres of social, economic and political life. Although the state must continue to exercise control, the state must be brought under the efficient control of its citizens.

While it is not possible today to make concrete and detailed plans, it is possible to formulate in a tentative fashion the intermediate goals for a socialist society. It will take many years of study and experimentation to arrive at more definite and specific formulations, studies to which the best brains and hearts of the nation must be devoted:

● Following the principle that social control and not legal ownership is the essential principle of socialism, its first goal is the transformation of all large enterprises in such a way that their administrators are appointed and fully controlled by all participants (workers, clerks, engineers, administrators, etc.) together with trade unions and consumer representatives.

These groups constitute the highest authority for every large enterprise. They decide all basic questions of production, price, utilization of profits, etc. All participants share in the profit of the enterprise; they contribute also to the social and cultural needs of the whole society.

● The autonomy of an enterprise is restricted by central planning to the extent to which it is necessary to make production serve its social ends.

● Small enterprises should work on a cooperative basis, and they are to be encouraged by taxation and other means. Inasmuch as they do not work on a cooperative basis, the participants must share in the profits and control the administration on an equal basis with the owner.

● Certain industries which are of basic importance for the whole of society, such as oil, banking, television, radio and transportation, must be nationalized, but the administration of these nationalized industries must follow the same principles of effective con-

trol by participants, unions and consumers.

Serving Social Needs

● In all fields in which there is a social need, but not an adequate existing production, society must finance enterprises which serve these needs.

● The individual must be protected from fear and the need to submit to anyone's coercion. In order to accomplish this aim, society must provide, free for everyone, the minimum necessities of material existence in food, housing and clothing. Anyone who has higher aspirations for material comforts would have to work for them, but the minimal necessities of life being guaranteed, no person can have power over anyone on the basis of direct or indirect material coercion.

● Socialism does not do away with individual property for use; neither does it require the complete levelling of income; income should be related to effort and skill; but differences in income should not create such different forms of material life that the life experience of one can not be shared by, and thus remains alien to, another.

● The principle of political democracy must be implemented in terms of XXth Century reality. Considering our technical instrumentalities of communication and tabulation, it is possible to reintroduce the principle of the town meeting into contemporary mass society. The forms in which this can be accomplished need study and experimentation. They may consist of the formation of hundreds of thousands of small face-to-face groups (organized along the principle of place of work or place of residence) which would constitute a new type of Lower House, sharing decision making with a centrally elected par-

liament. Decentralization must strive at putting important decisions into the hands of the inhabitants of small local areas subject, however, to the fundamental principles which govern the life of the whole society. But whichever forms are to be found, the essential principle is that the democratic process is transformed into one in which well-informed and responsible citizens express themselves and are not automatized mass-men, controlled by the methods of hypnoid mass suggestion.

Dealing With Bureaucracy

- Not only in the sphere of political decisions, but with regard to all decisions and arrangements, the grip of the bureaucracy must be broken in order to restore freedom. Aside from decisions which filter down from above, activity in all spheres of life on the grass-roots level must be developed which can filter from below to the top. Workers organized in unions, consumers organized in consumers' organizations, citizens organized in the above-mentioned face-to-face political units, must be in constant interchange with central authorities. This interchange must be such that new measures, laws, provisions, etc., can be suggested and after voting, decided from the grass-roots, and that all elected representatives are subject to continuous critical appraisal and if necessary, recall.

- According to its basic principles, the aim of socialism is the abolition of national sovereignty, the abolition of any kind of armed forces, and the establishment of a commonwealth of nations.

- In the sphere of education, the main aim is that of helping to develop the critical powers of the individual, to immunize him against all attempts

to manipulate him and to exploit his suggestibility; knowledge should not be a mass of information, but the use of reason for the understanding of the underlying forces determining material and human processes. Knowledge must not serve only the aims of material production, but that of the full development of each individual, his reason, and his whole character. In order to balance the dangers of alineated intellectualization, theoretical instruction shall go together with manual work in primary and secondary education. Each adolescent must have had the experience of producing something valuable with his own hands and skills.

- The principle of irrational authority based on power and exploitation must be replaced—not by a laissez-faire attitude, but by an authority which is based on the competence of knowledge and skill—not on intimidation, force or suggestion. Socialist education must arrive at a new concept of rational authority which differs both from irrational authoritarianism and from an unprincipled laissez-faire attitude.

- Education must not be restricted to childhood and adolescence, but the existing forms of adult education must be greatly enlarged. It is especially important to give each person the possibility of changing his occupation or profession at any time of life; this will be economically possible if at least his minimal material needs were taken care of by society.

- Cultural activities must not be restricted to providing intellectual education. All forms of artistic expression (through music, dance, drama, painting, sculpture, architecture, etc.) are of paramount importance for the human development of man. Society must channel considerable means for the creation

of a vast program of artistic activities and useful as well as beautiful building programs, even at the expense of some other and less important consumer satisfactions.

- Complete equality of races and sexes is a matter of course for a socialist society. This equality, however, does not imply sameness, and every effort must be made to permit the fullest development of the gifts and talents peculiar to each racial and national group, as well as to the two sexes.

- Freedom of religious activities must be guaranteed, together with the complete separation of State and Church.

The Choice for Man

We appeal to every citizen to feel his responsibility for his life, that of his children, and that of the whole human family. Man is on the verge of the most crucial choice he has ever made: whether to use his skill and brain to create a world which can be—even if not a paradise—a place for the fullest realization of man's potentialities, a world of joy and creativity, or a world which will destroy itself either with atomic bombs, or through boredom and emptiness.

Many will say that people do not want ideals, that they do not want to go beyond the frame of reference in which they live. We socialists say that this is

not true. On the contrary, people have a deep longing for something they can work for, have faith in. Man's whole vitality depends on the fact that he transcends the routine part of his existence, that he strives for the fulfillment of a vision which is not impossible to realize—even though it has not yet been achieved.

If he has no chance to strive for a rational, humanistic vision, he will eventually—worn out and depressed by the boredom of his life—fall prey to the irrational, satanic visions of dictators and demagogues. It is exactly the weakness of contemporary society that it offers no ideals, that it demands no faith, that it has no vision—except that of more of the same. We socialists are not ashamed to confess that we have a deep faith in man and in a vision of a new, human form of society. We appeal to the faith, hope and imagination of our fellow citizens to join us in this vision, and in the attempt to realize it. Socialism is not only a social-economic and political program; it is a human program: the realization of the ideals of humanism under the conditions of an industrial society.

Socialism must be radical. To be radical is to go to the roots; and the root is man. Today, Things are in the saddle and ride man. Socialism wants to put man, the total, creative, real man, back into the saddle.

A New Socialist Program

From the Basic Program: SPD

SOcialists aim to establish a society in which every individual can develop his personality, and as a responsible member of the community, take part in the political, economic and cultural life of mankind.

Freedom and justice are interdependent, since the dignity of man rests on his claim to individual responsibility just as much as on his acknowledgement of the right of others to develop their personality and, as equal partners, help shape society.

Freedom, justice and solidarity, which are everyone's obligation toward his neighbors and spring from our common humanity, are the fundamental values of socialism.

Democratic socialism, which in Europe is rooted in Christian ethics, humanism and classical philosophy, does not proclaim ultimate truths—not because of any lack of understanding for or indifference to philosophical or religious truths, but out of respect for the individual's choice in these matters of conscience in which neither the state nor any political party should be allowed to interfere.

The Social Democratic Party is the party of freedom of thought. It is a community of men holding different beliefs and ideas. Their agreement is based on the moral principles and political aims they have in common. The Social Democratic Party strives for a way of life in accordance with these principles. Socialism is a constant task—to fight for freedom and justice, to preserve them and to live up to them.

Demands of a Worthy Society

From the acceptance of democratic socialism certain basic demands follow which must be fulfilled in a society worthy of man.

All peoples must submit to the rule of international law backed by adequate executive power. War must be ruled out as a means of policy.

All peoples must have equal opportunities to share in the world's wealth. Developing countries have a claim to the help of other peoples.

We are fighting for democracy. Democracy must become the universal form of state organization and way of life because it is founded on respect for the dignity of man and his individual responsibility.

We resist every dictatorship, every form of totalitarian or authoritarian rule because they violate human dignity, destroy man's freedom and the rule of law. Socialism can be realized only through democracy and democracy can only be fulfilled through socialism.

Communists have no right to invoke socialist traditions. In fact, they have falsified socialist ideas. Socialists are struggling for the realization of freedom and justice while Communists exploit the conflicts in society to establish the dictatorship of their party.

In the democratic state, every form of power must be subject to public control. The interest of the individual must be subordinated to the interest of the community. Democracy, social security and individual freedom are endangered by an economic and social system in

Spring, 1960

which striving for profit and power are the distinguishing features. Democratic socialism therefore aspires after a new economic and social order.

All privileged access to educational institutions must be abolished. Talent and achievement should be the sole criteria of advancement.

Freedom and justice cannot be guaranteed by institutions alone. Technology and organization are exerting a growing influence on all areas of life. This creates new dependencies which threaten freedom. Only diversity in economic, social and cultural life can stimulate the creative powers of the individual without which man's mind is paralyzed.

Freedom and democracy are only thinkable in an industrial society if a constantly growing number of people develop a social consciousness and are ready to help shoulder responsibility. A decisive means to this end is political education in its widest sense. It is an essential objective of all educational efforts in our time.

The Economy of Expansion

The goal of Social Democratic economic policy is the constant growth of prosperity and a just share for all in the national product, a life in freedom without undignified dependence and without exploitation.

The Second Industrial Revolution makes possible a rise in the general standard of living greater than ever before, and the elimination of poverty and misery still suffered by large numbers of people.

Economic policy must secure full employment while maintaining a stable currency, increase productivity and raise general prosperity.

To enable all people to take part in the country's growing prosperity there

must be planning to adjust the economy to the constant structural changes in order to achieve a balanced economic development.

Such a policy demands national accounting and a national budget. The national budget must be approved by Parliament. It is binding on government policy, provides an important basis for the policies of the autonomous central bank, and establishes guiding lines for the economy which keeps its right to make independent decisions.

The modern state exerts a constant influence on the economy through its policies on taxation, finance, currency and credits, customs, trade, social services, prices and public contracts as well as agriculture and housing. More than a third of the national income passes through the hands of the government. The question is therefore not whether measures of economic planning and control serve a purpose, but rather who should apply these measures and for whose benefit. The state cannot shirk its responsibility for the course the economy takes. It is responsible for securing a forward-looking policy with regard to business cycles and should restrict itself to influencing the economy mainly by indirect means.

Free choice of consumer goods and services, free choice of working place, freedom for employers to exercise their initiative as well as free competition are essential conditions of a Social Democratic economic policy. The autonomy of trade unions and employers' associations in collective bargaining is an important feature of a free society. Totalitarian control of the economy destroys freedom. The Social Democratic Party therefore favors a free market wherever free competition really exists. Where a market is dominated by individuals or

groups, however, all manner of steps must be taken to protect freedom in the economic sphere. As much competition as possible—as much planning as necessary.

A significant feature of the modern economy is the constantly increasing tendency toward concentration. Large-scale enterprises exert a decisive influence not only on the development of the economy and the standard of living but also on the structure of the economy and of society.

Those who control large industrial concerns, huge financial resources and tens of thousands of employees do not merely perform an economic function but wield decisive power over men; wage and salary earners are kept in a position of dependence, and not only in purely economic and material matters.

Wherever large-scale enterprises predominate, free competition is eliminated. Those who have less power have fewer opportunities for development, and remain more or less fettered. The consumer occupies the most vulnerable position of all in the economy.

Increased power through cartels and associations gives the leaders of big business an influence on politics and the state which is irreconcilable with democratic principles. They usurp the authority of the state. Economic power becomes political power.

This development is a challenge to all who consider freedom, justice, human dignity and social security the foundations of human society.

The key task of an economic policy concerned with freedom is therefore to contain the power of big business. State and society must not be allowed to become the prey of powerful sectional groups.

Private ownership of the means of

production can claim protection by society as long as it does not hinder the establishment of social justice.

Efficient small and medium-sized enterprises are to be strengthened to enable them to prevail in competition with large-scale enterprises.

The Role of Competition

Competition by public enterprise is an important means of preventing private enterprise from dominating the market. Public enterprise should safeguard the interests of the community as a whole. It becomes a necessity where, for natural or technical reasons, economic functions vital to the community cannot be carried out in a rational way except by excluding competition.

Large-scale publicity should give the people an insight into the power structure of the economy and into business practices in order that public opinion may be mobilized against abuses of power.

Effective public control must prevent the abuse of economic power. The most important means to this end are investment control and control over the forces dominating the market.

Public ownership is a legitimate form of public control which no modern state can do without. It serves to protect freedom against domination by large economic concerns. In these concerns power is held today by managers who are themselves the servants of anonymous forces. Private ownership of the means of production is therefore no longer identical with the control of power. Economic power, rather than ownership, is the central problem today. Where sound economic power relations cannot be guaranteed by other means, public ownership is appropriate and necessary.

Every concentration of economic

power, even in the hands of the state, harbors dangers. This is why the principles of self-government and decentralization must be applied to the public sector. The interests of wage and salary earners as well as the public interest and the interests of the consumer must be represented on the management boards of public enterprises. Not centralized bureaucracy but responsible co-operation between all concerned serves the interests of the community best.

Distribution of Income and Wealth

The competitive economy does not guarantee by itself just distribution of income and wealth. This can only be achieved through measures of economic policy.

Income and wealth are distributed unjustly. This is not only the result of mass destruction of property through crises, war and inflation but is largely due to an economic and fiscal policy which has favored large incomes and the accumulation of capital in the hands of a few, and which has made it difficult for those without capital to acquire it.

The Social Democratic Party aims to create conditions in which everybody is able to save part of his rising income and acquire property. This presupposes a constant increase in production and a fair distribution of the national income.

Wage and salary policies are adequate and necessary means of distributing incomes and wealth more justly.

Appropriate measures must ensure that an adequate part of the steadily growing capital of big business is widely distributed or made to serve public purposes. It is a deplorable symptom of our time that privileged groups in society indulge in luxury while important public tasks, especially in the fields of

science, research and education, are neglected in a way unworthy of a civilized nation.

Trade Unions in the Economy

All wage and salary earners and civil servants have the right to free association in trade unions. They would be helplessly exposed to those in positions of command in enterprises and concerns unless they were able to confront the latter with the united force of their free and democratically organized trade unions and freely to agree on working conditions.

Trade unions fight to secure wage and salary earners a fair share of the country's wealth and the right to a voice in decisions affecting economic and social life.

Co-determination in the iron and steel industry and in coal mining marks the beginning of a new economic structure. The next step should be the establishment of a democratic organizational structure in all large enterprises. Co-determination by employees in the independent administrative bodies set up in the economy must be secured.

Expanding Social Values

Social policy must create the essential conditions which allow the individual to unfold freely in society and which determine his life according to his own responsibility. Social conditions that lead to individual and social hardship cannot be accepted as inevitable and unchangeable. The system of social security must correspond to the dignity of responsible individuals.

The creative powers of the individual must be given a chance to unfold freely in a full and diverse cultural life. The state should encourage and support all forces willing to make a contribution to

cultural progress. The state must protect the citizen against all attempts by power groups or sectional interests at making the people's spiritual and cultural life subservient to their own purposes.

The freedom of artistic work must be guaranteed. State and municipality should make public means available to support the creative elements in the community. No regimentation, especially no censorship, must restrict free artistic creation.

Democratic states must express their solidarity especially with the developing countries. Half of the world's population still lives in extreme poverty and ignorance. So long as the wealth of the world is not redistributed and the productivity of developing countries raised considerably, democratic development is in jeopardy and peace continues to be threatened. All peoples are obliged to fight starvation, misery and disease by a common effort. Their economic, social and cultural development must be inspired by the ideas of democratic socialism if they are not to become the victims of new forms of oppression.

The International Community

The socialist movement has an historic task. It began as a spontaneous moral protest of wage earners against the capitalist system. The tremendous development of the productive forces with the help of science and technology brought wealth and power to a small group of people, but only destitution and misery to the workers. To abolish the privileges of the ruling classes and to secure freedom, justice and prosperity for all was and remains the essence of the socialist aim.

Despite heavy setbacks and some errors the Labor movement succeeded in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in winning recognition for many of its demands. The proletarian who was once without protection and rights, who had to work sixteen hours a day for a starvation wage, achieved the eight hour day, protection at work, insurance against unemployment, sickness, disability and destitution in old age.

He achieved the prohibition of child labor and night work for women, the legal protection of youth and mothers, and holidays with pay. He successfully fought for the right to assemble and to form trade unions, the right to collective bargaining and to strike. He is about to obtain the right to co-determination. Once a mere object of exploitation, the worker now occupies the position of a citizen in the state with equal rights and obligations.

These successes represent milestones on the march forward of the labor movement which has demanded so many sacrifices. The emancipation of the workers helped to enlarge the freedom of all men. From a party of the working class the Social Democratic Party has become a party of the people. It is determined to put the forces unleashed by the industrial revolution and the advance of technology in all spheres of life to the service of freedom and justice for all.

Only the prospect of a society based on the fundamental values of democratic socialism can offer the world new hope, a society resting on respect for human dignity, on freedom from want and fear, from war and oppression, which is built in cooperation with all men of good will.

A Socialist Program for 1960

Norman Thomas

WITHIN RECENT months, I have been asked more often than formerly to tell audiences or groups of interested individuals why I am a Socialist. Usually the request is prefaced by observations to the effect that the best parts of Socialist platforms have been accepted by Republicans and Democrats, and that the obviously practical way to get something done is to join one or another of the old parties—usually, they say, the Democrats—and drop the name, Socialist, which is a source of nothing but misunderstanding in the United States.

Parallel to such observations I have run across a growing sense among active trade unionists that no group has taken the place of the Socialists and Young People's Socialist League within the life of the union and that there is no one to carry on constructive propaganda activities. That in itself, I tell them, is a reason to keep the Socialist Party alive.

How To Be Carried Out

My questioners are inclined at once to give us Socialists too much credit and too little. Too much credit for what has been accomplished, too little for the magnitude of our Socialist purpose and our Socialist hope. It is quite true that numerically most of the immediate demands in Socialist platforms going back to Gene Debs' first platform in 1900 have been carried out somehow. (I like to say that the differences between the Republicans and the Democrats is that the Democrats carried them out rather

cheerfully and the Republicans reluctantly, to which I ought to add that, in effect, even the Democrats carried out some of our proposals on a stretcher.)

But the point is, of course, that neither Democrats nor Republicans have seriously tried to bring fulfillment to individuals in a society in which peace, plenty and freedom prevail. Whatever has been done to change the terrible capitalism which Marx described and against which the Socialist movement was both protest and promise of better possibility for men, we still live in a world characterized by economic madness and injustice. This truth is symbolized by the fact that its richest men are the King of Saudi Arabia and the American oil barons, Paul Getty and H. L. Hunt. The Socialist intent was—and is—to achieve something better than the American "affluent society" which has pockets of inexcusably bitter poverty. Ours is still a country in which the national product is distributed by no means solely on the basis of men's deeds and needs, but also, and conspicuously, on the basis of their breed and their greed.

Success of many of the reforms which make capitalism after the New Deal better than capitalism before it has been frustrated by the persistent refusal even of so-called liberals to challenge a land system under which rent and the unearned increment of its sale which are solely social creations are mostly appropriated by individual owners. All effective action to clear out slums or to carry out decent planning for our cities or

urban areas is blocked by the fact that we have to pay individuals for their successful capitalization of the congestion we try to end.

What Wealthy Farmers Reap

In rural areas we are spending between five and six billion dollars annually to help farmers under what we jokingly call a free enterprise system, which has worked to their relative disadvantage. Most of the money goes to rich corporations and individuals, not to subsistence farmers. The politicians of both parties at the behest of the American Farm Bureau Federation successfully excluded farm laborers, more than 500,000 of them migrant laborers, from almost all Social Security and altogether from the protection of a minimum wage. I could multiply illustrations of the stupidity and injustice which make the current smugness about our affluent society, even in liberal circles, rather disgusting.

This, I tell inquirers, is the first reason I am a Socialist. We believe that the public good, which means the good of all men as individuals, is something to be planned for and cannot be a by-product of a private drive for profit and power.

The right sort of planning may not require so much social ownership through the direct action of the state as once many of us Socialists assumed. It is certain that mere nationalization, or even socialization, of basic industries and resources is not a sure single-track road to Utopia. Our planning must encourage cooperatives. It must make wide use of taxation, clearing out a jungle of taxes, local, state and federal, in favor of three broad types of taxation: the recovery of the rental value of land by the state through a tax; a graduated tax

on incomes; and a very heavy tax on inheritances, with respect paid to the needs of widows and dependent children. To this may be added sales taxes on luxuries, liquor, tobacco and cosmetics but not the range of sales taxes now in general use.

The Case for Socialization

I have argued in the pages of the CALL that the logical way to deal with administered prices in a basic industry like steel, controlled by a very few companies, is through socialization. Such socialized industry should be managed like TVA but with direct representation of workers, and possibly of certain classes of consumers on a managerial board. One of the tasks that we Socialists confront is to do some fresh thinking on what ought to be socialized, how and why.

My second reason for being a Socialist is that in our world of anarchic sovereign national states, the Socialist movement has come nearest to having an international ideal and program. True, we haven't come near enough. We missed one of the great opportunities of history in 1914, when European Socialists were not prepared to strike on both sides of the line against mobilization as World War I suddenly approached.

It is hard for us who have to act politically if we are to act democratically within the political machinery of national states to remember and give effect to our old passion of internationalism of workers, but we haven't dropped the ideal. It is worth recording that the Socialist International is the only political body which is on record as advocating that each nation should pay 1% of its national income to a central fund to be used under UN auspices for the con-

quest of bitter poverty in the world. This struggle should be our moral equivalent of war.

Toward World Disarmament

But the elimination of the war which has become impossible in the nuclear age, if men want their civilization or even their race to live, requires more than contribution to a central fund for economic development. Here I admit that we Socialists have not developed as clearly as we should a program for universal disarmament under a strengthened UN which is our only sure hope of security for ourselves or for liberty.

This program of disarmament and the strengthening of the UN must necessarily be accompanied by a constructive program to deliver us from potential crises worsened and not bettered by our government's indiscriminate alliances and its indefensible degradation of the adjective "free" so that it applies to all nations not under Communist tyranny—the Afrikaaneers' South Africa, Syngman Rhee's Korea, Franco's Spain, for example. Here we Socialists in the United States and every other nation need to develop a far more concrete program than we have. But as matters stand, there is no question that one element in the world's plight has been the weakness of socialism in the United States. This is taken as an indication that American capitalism is both more reactionary and more militantly aggressive than in fact it is.

My third reason for being a Socialist is that Socialists are more concerned about the application of democracy in industry and politics than any other group. We haven't all the answers to the problems of relations of management and industry, or to participation of individuals in the government of the

industries and services in which they are employed. But it is our conscious concern, and we Americans owe a great debt to Erich Fromm for making us aware of it.

The American Electoral System

One of our hardest problems here in the United States lies in the realm of tactics. Our method of electing a president has doomed the Socialist Party as it has doomed every third party in American history to electoral failure. (The Republican Party is no exception; it became a second party at its first national election in 1856.) We Socialists have done better than most in that we, unlike the Liberty Party, the Free Soilers, the Populists, the Bull Moose Progressives, the La Follette Progressives, and many others, are still alive. If the President of the United States were elected, as he should be, by popular vote with uniform rules for nominating candidates, and fair and uniform qualifications for voting, we would probably be a strong party today. We certainly should if the presidential elections were, as they should be, decided by preferential ballots in which voters could indicate the order of their choices, or with a provision for a run-off between the two highest candidates if neither had won a majority.

As it is, the increasing complexities and difficulties of getting on the ballot in 50 states, the increasing cost of campaigning, and the increased opposition of the AFL-CIO to any candidate who might draw votes from the candidates it endorses, make it impossible in 1960 for us to wage the kind of campaign that in my judgment would justify the struggle it would entail. I say this with sorrow. If in 1960 we were relatively where we were in 1948 I might think

it our duty to run candidates. But only if they could run and not stand.

Emphatically there is no moral imperative laid on Socialists to abstain from electoral action unless they can nominate their own candidates. Rather the contrary. Certainly there are better ways to invest time and money in advancing socialism than by vying with dogmatic sectarian Socialists of other parties for a pitiful handful of votes. Granting that we are conditioned to think of parties only as campaigners for votes, there are surely ways that we can find better to invest our time and energy than in the kind of campaign that circumstances forced on us and our devoted candidates in 1956.

We can work harder and more intel-

ligently as Socialists within labor's ranks, and possibly in some states in the primaries of old parties. We can organize teams to heckle candidates of old parties on the basis of our carefully drawn platform; we can publicize results, remembering that differences between more or less agreement with our positions may be very important in these times. We may find some congressional districts and strong Socialist candidates to run in them where we can make really significant campaigns. Above all, in and out of a campaign we can educate for socialism and the essential realignment of American parties. Such, in brief, are my present opinions on desirable Socialist tactics, opinions which I hope will commend themselves to our convention.

MAY DAY-1960

DARLINGTON HOOPES,
Vice Chairman, S.P.-S.D.F.

May Day as a labor holiday was started in the United States by workers who were striking for the eight hour day. In 1889 it was designated as Labor Day by the International Workingmen's Congress—the Second Socialist International. Over the years millions of people in all parts of the world have celebrated this day by marching, meeting and raising their voices against every form of tyranny. They do so again in 1960 because noble human spirit will ever defy the clubs and guns of dictators and despots.

The Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation of the United States extends comradely greetings to the downtrodden and oppressed

peoples of Hungary, South Africa, Franco Spain, Algeria, the Dominican Republic, and all other places where brute force holds sway, including those parts of the United States where our colored brothers are being beaten and jailed for peacefully protesting against racial discrimination.

We join with freedom loving people everywhere in paying homage to the noble souls who have bravely and gladly died for liberty, equality and fraternity. We know and rejoice that the struggle will go on until the last vestige of oppression is wiped from the face of the earth.

British Socialism Brought Up to Date

Hugh Gaitskell

IT WAS NOT BAD ORGANIZATION or a poor program, or too late a start, which lost us the election. I believe that we must look for more fundamental influences. The stark fact is that this is the third successive general election we have lost, and the fourth in which we have lost seats. This is a grave development which we must take most seriously. What has caused this adverse trend? It is, I believe, a significant change in the economic and social background of politics.

First, there is the changing character of the labor force. Everywhere the balance is shifting away from heavy physical work and towards machine maintenance, distribution and staff jobs. It is an inevitable result of technological advance. But it means that the typical worker of the future is more likely to be a skilled man in a white over-all, watching dials in a bright new modern factory than a badly paid cotton operative working in a dark and obsolete XIXth century mill.

The second great change is the absence of serious unemployment or even the fear of it. Of course, the change would never have occurred but for the insistence by the British Labor Movement that a government with the will and the power could maintain full employment and that, therefore, the power of the State over the economy must be increased. This is exactly what has happened.

An End to Booms and Slumps

But is not this only a temporary phenomenon? Is not another slump just round the corner? This is not an easy question to answer categorically. I can only say that in my opinion capitalism has significantly changed, largely as a result of our own efforts. The capacity of the government to plan the economy has substantially increased; the Budget absorbs a quarter of the national income; public investment is now nearly half of total investment; most of the basic industries are in public hands.

All these are vital changes. They still may not have gone far enough. But, in my opinion, they have gone sufficiently far to make it most unlikely that we shall again suffer from the great booms and slumps of the pre-war period. We can probably expect a further improvement in living conditions of the same kind as that experienced in recent years.

To full employment we can add the Welfare State—another of our achievements which has had profound consequences. Holidays show another profound change. It is still true that many people do not go away from home. But vastly more do. Most obviously, perhaps, there is the increase in cars. Before the next election there may well be two million more car owners than there are today.

I do not believe that the social and economic changes of which I have spoken were bound to react against us. They did so simply because we did not take them sufficiently into account. We assumed too readily an instinctive loyalty to Labor which was all the time being gradually eroded. We failed to appreciate that we should have to make a special conscious effort to win over these younger, newer, social groups.

We should put more stress on the issues which specially appeal to younger people. I believe these include the cause of colonial freedom; the protection of the individual against ham-handed and arrogant bureaucracy; resistance to the squalid commercialism which threatens to despoil our countryside and disfigure our cities; a dislike of bumbledom in all forms; a greater concern for sport and the arts. And I believe, too, that young people still respond more to idealism than to purely selfish causes.

We have to show them that we are a modern mid-twentieth century party, looking to the future, not to the past. We should welcome and encourage newcomers. We should look on them as friends to be won over, not intruders to be frozen out. Nor should we start by imposing too much heavy

political doctrine, particularly on young people.

The Question of Nationalization

Now I turn to public ownership and nationalization. There seems no doubt that, if we are to accept the majority view of those who fought this election, nationalization—on balance—lost us votes. No one suggests it was the main cause, but anything which appears to have swung votes against us deserves careful and, as far as possible, dispassionate study.

Why was nationalization apparently a vote loser? For two reasons, I believe. First, some of the existing nationalized industries are unpopular. This unpopularity is very largely due to circumstances which have nothing to do with nationalization. London omnibuses are overcrowded and slow—not because the Transport Commission is inefficient, but because of the state of London traffic. The backward conditions of the railways are not really the result of bad management, but of inadequate investment in the past which has left behind a gigantic problem of modernization. Coal costs more—not because the Coal Board has done badly, but because in the post-war world we have to pay miners a decent wage to induce them to work in the pits.

But all these things are blamed on nationalization. Tory propaganda has gone all-out to achieve precisely this result. Every weakness or grumble is magnified in the Tory press; every success is minimized or ignored. We must make an even bigger effort to counter this pernicious propaganda. The Boards themselves could help—not for us, but in their own interests, for the sake of goodwill and better morale.

Some suggest that we should accept for all time the present frontiers between the public and private sectors. We cannot do that. It would imply that everything works so perfectly in the private sector that we shall never want to intervene. But things are far from perfect in the private sector. One industry after another is begging for government help. Recently, there have been critical reports by independent investigators—on the machine tool, ship-building, ship-ping and other industries. I do not mean that we shall want to nationalize all these

industries, but I do mean that we cannot conceivably commit ourselves to the view that no future Labor government will ever want to do anything about them.

The extension of the public sector will not necessarily take the form of what people call old-style nationalization, that is, the setting up of huge State monopolies by Act of Parliament. We had better recognize that, though large-scale organizations often have technical and economic advantages, they have human and psychological weaknesses; and that, though public monopolies are much better than private ones, all monopolies have their drawbacks. We may not be far from the frontier of this kind of giant State monopoly. We may be more concerned in the future with other forms of public ownership. But I cannot agree that we have reached the frontier of public ownership as a whole.

At the same time, I disagree equally with the other extreme view that nationalization or even public ownership is the be-all and end-all, the ultimate first principle and aim of socialism. I believe that this view arises from a complete confusion about the fundamental meaning of socialism and, in particular, a misunderstanding about ends and means.

Principles of Democratic Socialism

So I want now to set out what I, at any rate, regard as the basic first principles of British democratic socialism.

First, we express what G.D.H. Cole once called "a broad, human movement on behalf of the bottom dog"—on behalf of all those who are oppressed or in need or hardship. Thus, at home, our first concern is naturally for the less fortunate—the old, the sick, the widowed, the unemployed, the disabled and the badly housed; abroad, it is reflected in a deep concern for the well-being of peoples much, much poorer than ourselves, badly in need of help.

Second, we believe in social justice, in an equitable distribution of wealth and income. We do not demand exact equality. But we do demand that the differences should be related not to the accident of birth and inheritance, but on how much of effort, skill and creative energy we each contribute to the common good.

Third, we believe in a "classless society"—a society without the snobbery, the privilege, the restrictive social barriers which are still far too prevalent in Britain today.

Fourth, we believe in the fundamental equality of all races and of all peoples, and in the building of an international order which will enable them to live together in peace.

Fifth, British socialism has always contained an essential element of personal idealism—the belief that the pursuit of material satisfaction by itself without spiritual values is empty and barren and that our relations with one another should be based not on ruthless self-regarding rivalry but on fellowship and cooperation.

Sixth, we believe that the public interest must come before private interest. We are not opposed to individuals seeking to do the best they can for themselves and their families—indeed, we want them to do so. But we insist that the pursuit of private gain should not take precedence over the public good. The idea of public planning in the interests of the whole community, both for economic and social reasons, is certainly a basic principle of socialism.

Deciding the End in View

Finally, we believe that these things must be achieved with and through freedom and democratic self-government. We intend to maintain this for ourselves and, so far as lies within our power, to help others to enjoy it, too.

These, I believe, constitute the essential first principles of our democratic socialism. Everything else—nationalization, controls, our particular policies on housing or education or old-age pensions—constitute only the means to realizing these principles in practice.

The only official document which embodies such an attempt is the Party Constitution, written over forty years ago. It seems

to me that this needs to be brought up to date. For instance, can we really be satisfied today with a statement of fundamentals which makes no mention at all of colonial freedom, race relations, disarmament, full employment or planning? The only specific reference to our objectives at home is the well-known phrase:

"To secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. . ."

Standing as it does on its own, this cannot possibly be regarded as adequate. It lays us open to continual misrepresentation. It implies that common ownership is an end, whereas, in fact, it is a means. It implies that the only precise object we have is nationalization, whereas, in fact, we have many other Socialist objectives. It implies that we propose to nationalize everything, but do we? Everything?—the whole of light industry, the whole of agriculture, all the shops—every little pub and garage? Of course not. We have long ago come to accept a mixed economy, at least in some form—for the foreseeable future—in which case had we not better say so instead of going out of our way to court misrepresentation?

I am sure that the Webbs and Arthur Henderson, who largely drafted this Constitution, would have been amazed and horrified had they thought that their words were to be treated as sacrosanct forty years later in utterly changed conditions. Let us remember that we are a party of the future, not of the past, that we must appeal to the young as well as the old. It is no use waving the banners of a bygone age. The first need now, in the words of that great Socialist teacher, R. H. Tawney, 'is to treat sanctified formulae with judicious irreverence and to start by deciding what precisely is the end in view.'

Socialism as a Way of Life

Pershottam Trikumdas

SOcialism is a way of life. It may be likened to an arch supported by the twin pillars of freedom and social justice. I am convinced that in the absence of either of these pillars the arch cannot stand and if an arch is erected the pillars of which represent some other concepts the result will not be socialism.

I started by saying that it is a way of life. Life is for the living human and the way of life must be such that each individual in society finds his fulfillment through such an organization of society. We shall presently examine those fundamental needs which must be satisfied if such a society is to be evolved and maintained. Man does not live by bread alone, he occasionally needs the heady wine of freedom.

Looking at the problem from this point of view, socialism cannot be a doctrine, much less a dogma. The tentative ways and means we think of must not become the fundamentals as they often became in the hands of theorists or prophets who claim to have discovered the ultimate truth, to which everyone must conform. If we permit ourselves to do so we shall put ourselves in the strait jacket from which escape would be a difficult and laborious process.

Having been brought up in a very orthodox Hindu family I have come to have a wholesome contempt for soul-destroying conformism. Having rejected the so-called authority of religion and scriptures and God, I cannot bring myself to accept other scriptures or to worship at the shrines of other gods.

There is one thing I have learned

from life. It is that life and society is constantly in a state of flux and any claim of discovery of the most ideal solution of social problems which will bring heaven on earth must be rejected. Our solutions must of necessity be tentative and inevitably temporary, for the application of such solutions will bring before us surprising but new problems of which we had taken no account. I cannot also accept the ultimate wisdom of a prophet or a Pope nor the claim to supreme wisdom of a party or a dictator. If we do this the result will be conformism and slavery.

The human mind should not be put in bondage in the name of superior wisdom. "Dangerous" ideas alone have, if I know my history right, become the accepted truths of the next generation and have contributed to progress, freedom and greater understanding of the world in which we live. Copernicus had to hide the truth that deflated the human ego in its belief that man was the center of the universe while he was a mere insignificant speck of dust floating hither and thither blown about by the forces of which even today we have little understanding.

Gallileo had to recant the truth to save himself from prison if not from the fire to which the Inquisition was ready to consign him. Let us not have Inquisition in the holy name of socialism. Let us not have Lysenkos to whose wisdom all biologists must bow. Let us not have Pasternaks and Hlaskos, not to speak of the myriad of innocents who are made to grovel and conform for the sins and inequities which they knew nothing of

Spring, 1960

on their way to the receiving end of the bullet of the executioner at the base of their skulls.

The Satisfactions of Socialism

Let us now examine the basic needs of human kind which any society laying claims to being socialist must satisfy. These are food, clothing, shelter, and medical care on the purely physical plane. The satisfaction of these could be achieved even by a wise slave State. Then there are education, freedom from fear, in other words security, physical and social, leisure and privacy. The last two are very often forgotten by those who are in a hurry to leap over decades, who believe that herding people together in what they call a common effort is a concomitant of socialism.

Speaking of education, let us be careful not to mistake it for technical knowledge or efficiency. Education certainly includes a certain fund of knowledge but it is never merely that, unless the spirit of inquiry, of questioning, and also of rebellion, is kept alive, it will be knowledge without education. It may be that only a small percentage of humans are capable of achieving this in any society but society must make it possible for them to achieve it, and any society aspiring to build socialism must endeavor to increase that percentage.

Any society that neglects this will never move toward socialism, for to keep the spirit of socialism alive, free and fearless men are essential. You suppress them and the way is open to dictatorships, dogmatism, bureaucracy, conformism or tyranny.

Let us now examine what many socialists still consider to be the fundamentals of achieving the cherished goal. One of these is the belief that the nationalization of the means of production, dis-

tribution and exchange are the *sine qua non* of socialism. They believe that once this is done all exploitation will end. We have, however, no agreed definition of nationalization. In one sense everyone of the votaries of nationalization are agreed. It means that no individual will own any means of production. As to who and how they should be owned we find a diversity of opinions, ranging from State ownership through giant corporations to regional or municipal or cooperative ownership. In different sectors of production perhaps these diverse forms may have to be employed without dogmatically asserting the superiority of the one over the other.

I was at one time a firm believer in this *sine qua non* of socialism. If I am no longer as enthusiastic, it is because I have come to doubt the efficacy of this nostrum. Means of production are to be nationalized to a particular end, which is the increase in production without which, with fast growing populations, there will not be enough to go round. What if it does not happen? By shouting sabotage you do not improve facts. And the craze for increased production and the fear-ridden officials might easily lead to inhuman methods and norms. Such things have happened in the name of socialism.

If the nationalized sector of production is State-owned even the strike weapon would not be open to the harassed and oppressed workers, since the employer and the State are one. Whatever other means of ownership may be devised I am certain in my mind that State ownership is the one which does not and will not fit into socialist society. Experience has shown that it leads to bureaucracy, oppression and often inefficiency and corruption and, last but not least, the complete subjection of citi-

zens to an omnipotent State. Regional, municipal or cooperative ownership are definitely better, provided the political State stands alert to watch out for any oppressive tendency.

The Problem of Nationalization

Apart from all this, I am not sure that all means of production need to be nationalized. Let us examine this both in the industrial and agricultural sectors. To start with, let us clear our minds of one misconception. The division of economic organization of societies into capitalist and socialist no longer holds good. Classical capitalism has ceased to exist even in the "arch" capitalist paradise, the USA, in view of the fact that the State in many ways controls the so-called freedom of contract. Then there are the welfare States, where even more rigorous taxation and State control of the economy exist, although nationalization appears only here and there in States like Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries.

As for socialism, there are many countries which lay claim to being socialist, like the USSR and its Eastern European satellites, Yugoslavia and China and Viet Nam (North). I do not think that the socialism of my conception exists in any of these countries, nor do I believe that they are on the way to achieve socialism, much less communism, where the State will wither away. Making the State a more powerful Leviathan is a curious process of making it wither away. These latter countries have no doubt State capitalism. Let us not confuse it with socialism.

Even assuming that certain sectors of industry may have to be State-owned the question is where to draw the line. Humans being what they are, the line should be drawn very sharply at the es-

entials, leaving the others to function subject to provision for the protection of the workers against exploitation and provision for adequate social service. In any event, the form of management by a bureaucratic machinery, which has within it the germs of waste, inefficiency and corruption, should be avoided, if not eschewed. What that form may be is a matter of trial and error and no rigid preconception should be the guide. Three or four simultaneous methods may be tried out at the same time. These may be regional, municipal, cooperative or corporation management, with the participation of the consumer interests and workers. Another pitfall is monopoly. Ways must be found to prevent any of these enterprises from becoming monopolies, barring perhaps the post office and the railways, and competition must be assured.

I might add here that of all these forms cooperative management appears at first sight to be more attractive. Many of us, who have experience in cooperatives, and while accepting that this form has to be encouraged, have unfortunately reached the conclusion that the awareness among the members of their responsibilities and the integrity which is essential to successful cooperative management are unfortunately lacking at present. Also needed is a spirit of accommodation and selflessness which is difficult to find. Perhaps multi-purpose societies not actively engaged in actual production may be a way to create the right spirit.

Agriculture Under Socialism

Coming now to the agricultural sector, collectivization has proved to be a failure, both economically and in terms of human freedom. Theorists will not admit it, but those who are not pledged

to ram it down the throats of the world that their system is the best and are concerned to find out how the system works have albeit reluctantly admitted it—Yugoslavia and Gomulka have realized it and said so in no uncertain terms. If production can increase by private farms, is there any reason, in the name of theory, to force systems on the people in the holy name of socialism? Are we concerned with results or theories?

China has embarked on the Commune. We shall await the result with great interest. I am, however, apprehensive that it will lead only to further suppression of freedom whether it does result in increased production or not—most probably not.

Political Freedoms

Now I shall deal with the question of political freedom. Providing for the physical needs of the individual by a benevolent dictatorship, assuming that dictatorships can be benevolent, is not enough. Only that society will thrive and survive where the average citizen is conscious of his human dignity and sufficiently enlightened to pursue his own

life, no doubt in cooperation with his fellow-citizens, in the manner which he, along with his fellow-beings, decides.

Democracy is an evolving and dynamic phenomenon. It finds greater and greater fulfillment with the evolving consciousness of the people in general. To write off democracy because of its faults as they exist today is not fair or proper, except for those who believe in lording over others and making their lives for them. No democratic system in the very nature of things can be perfect or will be perfect. It has to adapt itself from time to time and generation to generation to the changing conditions in the world.

Of one thing, however, I am certain. It is that with all its faults, there is no other system in the world which leads to freedom of humankind. Bad as it may be, the alternatives are infinitely worse. I would say without hesitation, "give me even a bad democracy rather than the most perfect totalitarian system."

We may have democracy without socialism but we can never have socialism without democracy.

GREETINGS TO THE SOCIALIST CALL

Greetings to Socialists Everywhere!

Darlington Hoopes
Reading, Pa.

Samuel S. White
Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. & Mrs. Nargaard
Milwaukee, Wisc.

Dr. Frank Abbate
Pittsburgh, Penna.

Jack & Kate Barbash
Madison, Wisc.

Mrs. Grace A. MacMichael
North Adams, Mass.

Frances and Mitchell Loeb
Brooklyn, N. Y.

For A Strong Socialist Movement

Gandolfo Cascio
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Frank Lieberman
New York, N. Y.

Bernard Korn
Great Neck, N. Y.

Jasper McLevy
Bridgeport, Conn.

Edmund Hare
Philadelphia, Pa.

For Socialist Freedom & An End to all
Exploitation
Ephraim Friend
New York, N. Y.

Morris and Helen Fried
New York, N. Y.

GREETINGS TO THE SOCIALIST CALL

Local Berks
Pennsylvania

Local Chicago, SP-SDF

Letha & H. E. Madden
Hebron, Ohio

Erma Arnstein
San Francisco, Calif.

Mrs. R. C. Hunter
Delaware, Ohio

Joseph Dumont
Racine, Wisc.

Alice Dodge Wolfson
New York, N. Y.

Ned W. Weaver
Olympia, Washington

Antonio Di Guiseppe
Camden, New Jersey

John R. Mackenzie
Roanoke, Va.

Onward, Comrades! Our efforts are never
in vain, for we show the way.

Abraham Bronfman
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Ruth Christie
Long Lake, Minn.

Mr. & Mrs. John A. Stanavage
Boothwyn, Pennsylvania

Ada & Hank Mayer
Andes, N. Y.

Mrs. Max E. Liebers
Jamaica, L. I., New York

Wm. F. Leonard
West Bend, Iowa

Roy L. Farr
Evansville, Indiana

Wm. Herman
Los Angeles, Calif.

Charlie Nye Jones
Modesto, Calif.

In Memory of
Mrs. Lula S. Halvorsen
Who was active in the Socialist Party for
many years,
The Rabes, Farris and Lockyears

Fraternal Greetings to Comrades Don &
Carlie Anderson
James R. Flynn
Richmond, Kentucky

Beatrice & Michael Green
Plainview, N. Y.

Syd & Jeanette Bykofsky
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Workmen's Circle Branches 207-207B
M. J. Merlin Sec'y
Mr. R. Finestone
Atlanta, Ga.

Harry Siitonen
Los Angeles, Calif.

Frank W. Simington
Chicago, Illinois

Jacob Goldner
Elmhurst, N. Y.

In Memory of Lula Halvorsen
Morris Milgram
Philadelphia, Penna.

Kenneth Hagstrom
Southfield, Mich.

Harry & Natalie Fleischman
Wantagh, N. Y.

Hy Johnson
West Monroe, La.

Clifford Whiteside
Detroit, Mich.

Isaac Kantorovsky
New York, N. Y.

Anna Kofsky
Bronx, N. Y.

V. E. Rowton
Santa Monica, Calif.

Philip Stern
Long Island City, N. Y.

W. L. Calkin
Chicago Ill.

Nat Hillson
Pasadena, Calif.

Greetings to Socialists Around the World
Blanche H. Meyer
Milwaukee, Ore.

Michael & Sophia Charnofsky
Los Angeles 19, Calif.

Lubow A. M. Hanson
Adelphi, Md.

Meta Riseman
Detroit, Mich.

Humanist World Digest
1011 Heinz Ave.
Berkeley 10, Calif.
E. A. Corson, Editor

GREETINGS TO THE SOCIALIST CALL

Yours for democratic Socialism
San Francisco Local, SP-SDF

At 91, I still want Socialism
G. W. Wieneke
Fieldon, Ill.

Benjamin & Anne Williger
Elmhurst, Ill.

Anthony Jakubiszyn
Detroit, Mich.

Fred Meder
Milwaukee, Wisc.

May Day Greetings
Adele Schmitz
New York, N.Y.

Fraternal May Day Greetings to all Social-
ists throughout the world. Remember, May
Day is the only real international labor holi-
day.

Robert D. Mullen
Toledo, Ohio

Workmen's Circle Branch 24-164
J. Wanaev
Bronx, N.Y.

Greetings From Camden Branch
Morris Stempa
Audubon, N.J.

Walter O'Hagan
Auburn, N.Y.

Vincent Fiorentini
Ventura, Calif.

John M. Work
Milwaukee, Wisc.

Jewish Labor Bund, Los Angeles, Calif.
S. M. Oshry, Chairman
Joel Litewk, Sec'y

Shloyme Mendelson Reading Circle
Rose Rubin, Sec'y
Mary Debingoff, Treas.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Sam & Mollie Oshry
Los Angeles, Calif.

Anonymous

Adelaide Schulkind
New York, N. Y.

Ever more strength to Democratic Socialism
Anna G. Sachere
New York, N. Y.

Leroy Bowman
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Amicus Most
Mamaroneck, N. Y.

Socialism In Our Time
Clif Daland
Battle Creek, Mich.

M. A. Jacobsen
Staten Island, N. Y.

Mr. & Mrs. H. Miller
Passaic, New Jersey

We call them happy that endure
John Paul Jones
Ashfield, Mass.

Harry Fisher
Cloak & Suit Tailors Union
Local 9 ILGWU
22 W. 38 St.
New York, N. Y.

Bonnax, Embroideries
Tucking, Pleating & Allied Crafts Union
Local 66, ILGWU
225 W. 39th St.
New York, N. Y.

May Day Greetings
South Side Branch, SP-SDF
Local Chicago

Greetings and Best Wishes for The Call
James & Lilly Miller
Shelburn, Indiana

Anonymous

May Day Greetings
David Rinne
Library, Pa.

Pittsburgh Local
SP-SDF
Pittsburgh, Penna.

Workmen's Circle Branch 114
San Francisco, Calif.

Walter Ballenger
Mill Valley, Calif.

William and Bertha Mareneer
Lombard, Ill.

Carl Larusso
Erie, Penna.

Greetings
Local Detroit
SP-SDF

Greetings from
Fay & Rowland Watts
Pleasantville, N.Y.

Greetings
Max & Grace Kumer
Pittsburgh, Penna.

7th Ward Branch
SP-SDF has charter signed by
Eugene V. Debs, 1897
Milwaukee, Wisc.

VENTURE

quarterly magazine of the Students for Democratic Society, Student Department of the League for Industrial Democracy. The only nationally circulated magazine on social issues completely written by students. Send for sample copy, 112 East 19th Street New York 3, N. Y.

ESPANA LIBRE

TWICE-A-MONTH NEWSPAPER TELLS
ABOUT FRANCO'S SPAIN

\$5.00 A YEAR

CONSOLIDATED SPANISH SOCIETIES
231 WEST 18 ST., NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

GREETINGS ON MAY DAY

Los Angeles Workmen's Circle
Reading Club

Allie Fine	Fanny Elstein
William Friedman	Dora Breinin
Lube Shapiro	O. H. Robineau
Mrs. Kohl	Mary Maro

MAY DAY GREETINGS

Local 23, ILGWU, AFL-CIO
22 West 38th Street
New York, N.Y.
Shelley Appleton, Manager

Mrs. C. J. Serrurier
Hollywood, Calif.

Greetings!

New York Joint Board
AMALGAMATED CLOTHING
WORKERS OF AMERICA,
AFL-CIO

New York 11, N. Y.

Knitgoods Workers Union
815 Broadway
Brooklyn 6, N. Y.

Louis Nelson
Manager-Secretary

G. D. Procopio, Manager
Local 563, Shoe Service Union,
U.S.W.A., AFL-CIO
Brooklyn 17, N. Y.

Emil Brodde
Member, Socialist Party over 56
years. Member, AFL union over
62 years.
Milwaukee, Wisc.

Anonymous

Dr. Leon Pritcher
Beverly Hills, Calif.

GREETINGS!
DRESSMAKERS' JOINT COUNCIL
(JOINT BOARD DRESS & WAISTMAKERS'
UNION, ILGWU, AFL-CIO
 Charles S. Zimmerman, General Manager
 Nathaniel M. Minkoff, Secretary Treasurer
 Allan Nadle, Chairman, Dressmakers' Joint Council
 Leon Namenwirth, President, Joint Board
AMALGAMATED LADIES GARMENT
CUTTERS UNION
 Local 10
 Moe Falikman, Secretary Manager
DRESS & WAISTMAKERS UNION
 Local 22
 Israel Breslow, Manager-Secretary
DRESS & WAIST PRESSERS UNION
 Local 60
 William Schwartz, Manager-Secretary
ITALIAN DRESSMAKERS UNION
 Local 89
 Luigi Antonini, General-Secretary
NORTHEAST DEPARTMENT, ILGWU
 David Gingold, Director
EASTERN OUT OF TOWN DEPARTMENT,
ILGWU
 Edward Kramer, General Manager

IN MEMORY OF GEORGE K. NOVICK
friends and comrades of the

GEORGE K. NOVICK BRANCH, SP-SDF
989 Flatbush Avenue, Bklyn, N. Y.

Jerry Wurf
Meyer Colfin
Goldie & Harry Blum
Sylvia & George Aronov
Dora & Burt Beck
Clara & Charles Weinberg
Emanuel Muravchik

Jimmy Lipsig
Sam & Tessie Frost
Herman Singer
Irwin Suall
Bernard Englander
Robert Aks
Bernie & Lil Johnpoll

Brooklyn Branch SP-SDF
Working For A Revitalized
Socialist Movement In An
Awakened America
S. Bykofsky, Organizer
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Paper Box Makers Union,
Local 299
Int. Brotherhood of Pulp,
Sulphite and Paper Mill
Workers, AFL-CIO

Sam Shebitz, President

County Central Committee
SP-SDF
For Democratic Socialism only.
Milwaukee, Wisc.

B. Robbins
New York, N.Y.

GREETINGS!
JOINT BOARD OF
Cloak, Suit, Skirt & Reefer
Makers' Unions—ILGWU
AFL-CIO

HENOCK MENDELSUND
General Manager &
Secretary-Treasurer

Murray M. Kolker Rubin Zuckerman
Administrative Secretary President
Local 117
Benjamin Kaplan, Manager-Secretary
Local 9
Harry Fisher, Manager-Secretary
Local 10
Moe Falikman, Manager-Secretary
Local 23
Shelley Appleton, Manager-Secretary
Local 35
Morris Kovler, Manager-Secretary
Local 48
E. Howard Molisani, Manager-Secretary
Local 64
Samuel Rabinowitz, Manager-Secretary
Local 82
Joshua Fogel, Manager-Secretary

MAY DAY GREETINGS

from
Italian-American Comrades
Circolo Matteotti
S. Pernicone, Secy
New York, N.Y.

CLEVELAND LOCAL SP-SDF

Cleveland, Ohio

MAY DAY GREETINGS

to all Socialists everywhere.

We salute the southern Negro students!

NATIONAL OFFICE

Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation

Biennial National Convention
May 28, 29, 30th Burlington Hotel
Washington, D.C.

FRATERNAL GREETINGS
FOR A STRONG, FREE LABOR
MOVEMENT

CLOAK OUT-OF-TOWN
DEPARTMENT
ILGWU, AFL-CIO

GEORGE RUBIN,
GENERAL MANAGER

WORKING PEOPLE OF EVERY
NATION
FIND IN MAY DAY A RENEWED
DEDICATION TO THE
EVER-ADVANCING CAUSE OF
A FREE WORLD-WIDE TRADE
UNION MOVEMENT WHICH
ALWAYS STANDS IN THE
VANGUARD OF THE STRUGGLE

for
PEACE AND LIBERTY
and
FREEDOM FROM WANT

NORTHEAST DEPARTMENT
International Ladies'
Garment Workers Union
David Gingold
Director

WORKMEN'S MUTUAL FIRE
INSURANCE CO., INC.

227 EAST 84th STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

GREETINGS FROM

LOCAL NEW YORK, SP-SDF

Upper West Side Branch

Lower Manhattan Branch

Trade Union Branch

Brooklyn Branch

Queens Branch

George K. Novick Branch

Robert Koeppicus
City Chairman

THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF PULP, SUPHITE AND
PAPER MILL WORKERS EXTENDS A WARM SALUTATION TO
THE SOCIALIST CALL UPON MAY DAY 1960
JOHN P. BURKE, PRESIDENT-SECRETARY
INTERNATIONAL OFFICE, FORT EDWARD, NEW YORK

GREETINGS FROM
MECHANICS EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

May Day Greetings

SUPPORT THE FORAND BILL AND THE STRUGGLE FOR
INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH

Sam Bernstein—In Memory	Henry Fine
Arthur & Evelyn Bernstein	Sam Levin
Julius & Bess Bernstein	John C. Munro
John Keil	Gladys Heitin
Branch 716 E Workmen's Circle	Mr. & Mrs. S. S.
L.D.H.	Edith Eisenberg
M.S.R.	L.G.
Joseph B. Greenfield	L.P.
Frank & Kate Lyons	William Fisch
Leo & Ruth Leopold	Jason Orlov
Abraham Shapiro	Ralph A. Roberts
Enrico Parente	Jerome & Bette Shipman
Saul Freedman	Louis Ackerman
Eliot Klitzman	S.F.
Mrs. Ida Klitzman	Dorothy Muse
George Weiner	Leon Bloom

SUMMER 1960

THE

CALL

LET MAN PREVAIL

A Socialist Manifesto and Program

Erich Fromm

VOLUME XXVIII

Number 2

FIFTY CENTS